arXiv:quant-ph/9711053v2 23 Feb 1998

Structure of nonlinear gauge transformations

Marek Czachor
Katedra Fizyki Teoretycznej i Metod Matematycznych
Politechnika Gdańska, ul. Narutowicza 11/12, 80-952 Gdańsk, Poland

Nonlinear Doebner-Goldin [Phys. Rev. A **54**, 3764 (1996)] gauge transformations (NGT) defined in terms of a wave function $\psi(x)$ do not form a group. To get a group property one has to consider transformations that act differently on different branches of the complex argument function and the knowledge of the value of $\psi(x)$ is not sufficient for a well defined NGT. NGT that are well defined in terms of $\psi(x)$ form a semigroup parametrized by a real number γ and a nonzero λ which is either an integer or $-1 \le \lambda \le 1$. An extension of NGT to projectors and general density matrices leads to NGT with complex γ. Both linearity of evolution and Hermiticity of density matrices are gauge dependent properties.

PACS number(s): 03.65.-w

Adopting the view that *all* actual measurements of quantum mechanical systems are eventually reducible to those of particle positions at various moments of time [1–5] one has to accept a new gauge principle: All theories that give the same probability densities in *position* space for all times and all experimental arrangements are indistinguishable. Once we agree on this viewpoint the first question we have to answer is what is the most general set of transformations that leave probability densities in position space invariant. Certainly this set is bigger than just the unitary and anti-unitary ones. A class of *nonlinear* transformations of *wave functions* that have this property was extensively investigated by Doebner and Goldin, and their collaborators from the Clausthal school [6,8–15]. The Doebner-Goldin transformations are sometimes referred to as gauge transformations of the third kind.

Taking a linear Schrödinger equation and performing a gauge transformation of the third kind one arrives at an equivalent theory whose dynamical equation is in general nonlinear. Linearity is therefore a gauge dependent feature and, as such, cannot be physically essential. It follows that there exist nonlinear theories which are physically indistinguishable from standard quantum mechanics unless one finally invents an experiment which is not reducible to a measurement of position.

Gauge transformations of the third kind are defined at the level of *wave functions* [16] and are characterized by *two real* parameters:

$$\psi(x) \mapsto$$
$$N_{\lambda,\gamma}[\psi](x) = |\psi(x)| \exp\left[i\lambda \arg\psi(x) + i\gamma \ln|\psi(x)|\right]. \quad (1)$$

Here arg denotes a phase of $\psi(x)$. This phase possesses a $2n\pi$ ambiguity which is regarded as irrelevant [6]. Complex conjugation is a particular case of (1) and is given by $N_{-1,0}$. The transformation (1) leaves the positional probability density invariant

$$|N_{\lambda,\gamma}[\psi](x)| = |\psi(x)|. \quad (2)$$

If ψ satisfies an ordinary linear Schrödinger equation the transformed wave function is a solution of some nonlinear Doebner-Goldin equation (compare Eq. (11); for a detailed discussion cf. [6]). Starting with a solution ψ of a Doebner-Goldin equation one arrives at an equation belonging to the same class but with some parameters suitably transformed. All equations obtained from each other by $N_{\lambda,\gamma}$, with λ and γ t- and x-independent, are 1-homogeneous in ψ and therefore invariant under multiplication of ψ by constant factors. This shows that the phase ambiguity inherent in the definition of $\arg\psi$ does not lead to any ambiguity of the nonlinear modification of the corresponding Schrödinger equation.

The objective of this note is twofold. First, it will be shown that the phase ambiguity leads to a problem with group properties of nonlinear gauge transformations. This leads to two classes of transformations. One is characterized by nonzero integer λ and the other by nonzero real λ's satisfying $-1 \le \lambda \le 1$. In both cases one obtains a semigroup structure. Second, we shall see that there exists a natural extension of the Doebner-Goldin transformations involving *three* real parameters, but in order to find it one has to start with projector (or, more generally, density matrix) representation of states.

To see how the phase ambiguity affects the group property consider $N_{3/2,0}$ and a point x satisfying $\arg\psi(x) = \pi/4$ (now arg denotes both here and in (1) the unique principal branch of the argument function Arg i.e. $-\pi < \arg z \le \pi$). One finds that

$$N_{3/2,0} \circ N_{3/2,0}[\psi](x) = N_{9/4,0}[\psi](x) \quad (3)$$

which agrees with the affine group property mentioned in [6]. Now consider a point x' satisfying $\arg\psi(x') = 3\pi/4$. The argument of the transformed function is $\arg N_{3/2,0}[\psi](x') = -7\pi/8$. Aplying again $N_{3/2,0}$ to $N_{3/2,0}[\psi]$ at x' we find $\arg N_{3/2,0} \circ N_{3/2,0}[\psi](x') = 11\pi/16$. On the other hand $\arg N_{9/4,0}[\psi](x') = -5\pi/16$ and therefore

$$N_{3/2,0} \circ N_{3/2,0}[\psi](x') \neq N_{9/4,0}[\psi](x'). \quad (4)$$

It should be stressed that this property of $N_{\lambda,\gamma}[\psi]$ holds in general for a set of points of non-zero measure.

A closer look at the origin of this problem shows that the affine property

$$N_{\lambda',\gamma'} \circ N_{\lambda,\gamma} = N_{\lambda'\lambda,\lambda'\gamma+\gamma'}. \tag{5}$$

does not hold for non-integer λ ($|\lambda| > 1$) if one fixes a concrete branch of Arg in the definition (1). One can obtain (5) while maintaining the principal branch of Arg in (1) provided $-1 \le \lambda \le 1$, but then one gets a *semi-group* structure. Similarly, restricting λ's to integers one obtains a semigroup satisfying (5).

To obtain a group property one has to modify (1) in order to keep track of the branches of Arg. This can be done by introducing an additional integer quantum number and defining

$$\begin{aligned} &N_{\lambda,\gamma}[\psi]\big(x, n(\lambda,\gamma,m,x)\big) = |\psi(x,m)| \\ &\times \exp\big[i\lambda \arg\psi(x,m) + 2m\lambda\pi i + i\gamma \ln|\psi(x,m)|\big] \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where $n(\lambda,\gamma,m,x) = \mathrm{E}\Big(\frac{\lambda \arg\psi(x,m)}{2\pi} + m\lambda + \frac{\gamma \ln|\psi(x,m)|}{2\pi}\Big)$ and $\mathrm{E}\,(r)$ denotes an integer part of r. The transformations form a group but the price one has to pay is in the presence of the additional integer-valued function $n(\lambda,\gamma,m,x)$.

Alternatively, one can *start* with two functions $A(x)$ and $B(x)$, and the lower-triangular representation of the affine group:

$$\begin{pmatrix} A \\ B \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \gamma & \lambda \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A \\ B \end{pmatrix} =: \begin{pmatrix} A' \\ B' \end{pmatrix}. \tag{7}$$

The transformation $(A, B) \mapsto (A', B')$ induces a nonlinear action of the affine group in the space of wave functions

$$\psi = \exp[A + iB] \mapsto \exp[A' + iB'] =: \psi' \tag{8}$$

which is equivalent to NGT. This is an alternative way of introducing NGT and such NGT *do* form a group. However, it is essential that we *start* here with A and B, and *define* NGT at their level. If one wants to do this at the level of ψ (i.e use Eq. (1)) one will necessarily face the $2n\pi$ ambiguity in the definition of B and the group property is lost. This clearly shows that (1) and (7) are inequivalent. Let us note that working at the level of A and B we control the branches of Arg ψ since λB is given exactly and not modulo 2π. The problem with the group property therefore disappears if one sticks to the so-called hydrodynamic version of the Schrödinger equation [17] which does not make use of ψ but works entirely at the level of the (Hamilton-Jacobi) variables A and B.

If one does not want to introduce these additional structures and unambiguously compose transformations of the type (1), one has to choose either $-1 \le \lambda \le 1$ and use the principal branch of Arg, or restrict λ's to nonzero integers. In what follows we shall assume that one of these possibilities has been chosen. In both cases the transformations form a semigroup.

Consider now the problem of the number of parameters characterizing a nonlinear gauge transformation. The projective nature of quantum mechanical state space makes it more natural to work with $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ than with $|\psi\rangle$. The overall phase ambiguity is then automatically removed from the description and an extension from pure states to mixtures is natural. Let us begin with the pure state density matrix (projector) $\rho(x,y) = \psi(x)\overline{\psi(y)}$. The nonlinear gauge transformation of the wave function induces the following transformation of the corresponding projector

$$\begin{aligned} &N_{\lambda,\gamma}[\rho](x,y) \\ &= \rho(x,y) \exp\left[(\lambda-1)\mathrm{Ln}\frac{\rho(x,y)}{|\rho(x,y)|} + \frac{i\gamma}{2}\ln\frac{\rho(x,x)}{\rho(y,y)}\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

The assumption of a privileged role of the positional measurements leads to the requirement that the diagonal elements of density matrices in position space should be unchanged. This condtion is satisfied not only by (9) but also by a larger class of transformations involving a *complex* parameter γ_c. The transformed density matrices $N_{\lambda,\gamma_c}[\rho](x,y)$ are non-Hermitian but

$$N_{\lambda,\gamma_c}[\rho](x,x) = \rho(x,x). \tag{10}$$

It is interesting that the additional (imaginary) parameter in $N_{\lambda,\gamma_c}[\rho]$ does not show up if one starts with ψ. This is so because the logical structure of derivation of NGT is different for $|\psi\rangle$ than for $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$: For $|\psi\rangle$ one first performs a nonlinear transformation and then complex conjugates, finally requiring $|\psi'(x)| = |\psi(x)|$; for $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ one first complex conjugates $|\psi\rangle$ in order to get $\langle\psi|$, and then performs the nonlinear transformation. This is precisely the reason why the constraints imposed on NGT by the consequences of complex conjugation are different for general ρ (including pure states!) than for state vectors or wave functions.

It is evident that once we agree that linearity is a gauge dependent property we have to accept the same status of Hermiticity of density matrices. A gauge transformed density matrix satisfies an equation that is nonlinear and dissipative but physically may be indistinguishable from a linear and nondissipative theory.

The fact that NGT establishes an equivalence between classes of nonlinear Schr̈odinger equations and ordinary linear quantum mechanics automatically refutes all arguments for a fundamental impossibility of nonlinear extensions of the standard theory (see also [6]). Indeed, the transformations with $\lambda = 1$ and $\gamma \neq 0$ only add a nonlinear term while maintaining the form of the kinetic and potential terms in the Hamiltonian. To see this explicitly (cf. [15]) assume that ψ is a solution of a linear Schrödinger equation, $\psi' = N_{1,\gamma}[\psi]$, and γ is in general time dependent. Then

$$\begin{aligned} i\hbar\partial_t\psi' = \Big(-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\Delta + V\Big)\psi' + \frac{\hbar^2\gamma}{4m}\Big(iR_2 + 2R_1 - 2R_4\Big)\psi' \\ -\frac{\hbar^2\gamma^2}{8m}\Big(2R_2 - R_5\Big)\psi' - \frac{1}{2}\dot{\gamma}\ln\rho_{\psi'}\psi', \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where $\dot{\gamma} = d\gamma/dt$ and the nonlinear terms are ($\rho_{\psi'} = \psi'\bar{\psi}'$, $\vec{j}_{\psi'} = \frac{\hbar}{m}\mathrm{Im}\left\{\bar{\psi}'\vec{\nabla}\psi'\right\}$)

$$R_1 = R_1[\rho_{\psi'}, \vec{j}_{\psi'}] = \frac{m}{\hbar}\frac{\vec{\nabla}\cdot\vec{j}_{\psi'}}{\rho_{\psi'}} \tag{12}$$

$$R_2 = R_2[\rho_{\psi'}, \vec{j}_{\psi'}] = \frac{\Delta\rho_{\psi'}}{\rho_{\psi'}} \tag{13}$$

$$R_4 = R_4[\rho_{\psi'}, \vec{j}_{\psi'}] = \frac{m}{\hbar}\frac{\vec{j}_{\psi'}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\rho_{\psi'}}{\rho^2_{\psi'}} \tag{14}$$

$$R_5 = R_5[\rho_{\psi'}, \vec{j}_{\psi'}] = \frac{\vec{\nabla}\rho_{\psi'}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\rho_{\psi'}}{\rho^2_{\psi'}}. \tag{15}$$

For $\dot{\gamma} = 0$ the equation is 1-homogeneous in ψ'. For $\dot{\gamma} \neq 0$ the last term is the famous Białynicki-Birula–Mycielski logarithmic nonlinearity [18] which is widely believed to be ruled out experimentally. Let us note that this cannot be the case, since this would mean that the above nonlinear equation is ruled out as well, but this is simply the linear Schrödinger equation in a nonlinear disguise! Similarly, had all those impossibility proofs been correct in their generality, the equations of this type would have to generate unphysical effects. But the point is that they do not generate *any* new effects, provided one uses a consistently modified interpretation of the gauge transformed theory.

NGT of density matrices can be used to refute another argument of this variety. It is often stated that at the fundamental level the density matrices have to satisfy a linear equation since otherwise the convexity principle would be violated. By this it is meant that having two density matrices $\rho_1(x,y)$ and $\rho_2(x,y)$ their convex combination $p_1\rho_1(x,y) + p_2\rho_2(x,y)$ should also be a solution of the same equation and this implies linearity of the Liouville-von Neumann equation. However, even assuming that this argument is correct, the assumption that what we observe experimentally is determined only by the diagonal elements $\rho(x,x)$ implies that we should impose the convexity requirement only on the diagonal. An example of a nonlinear dynamics that possesses this kind of convexity is obtained by a NGT of a linear Liouville-von Neumann equation. Taking $\rho'(x,y) = N_{\lambda,\gamma_c}[\rho](x,y)$ we find that

$$[p_1\rho_1 + p_2\rho_2]'(x,y) \neq p_1\rho_1'(x,y) + p_2\rho_2'(x,y) \tag{16}$$

but

$$[p_1\rho_1 + p_2\rho_2]'(x,x) = p_1\rho_1(x,x) + p_2\rho_2(x,x). \tag{17}$$

Even very simple NGT of ρ (say, with $\lambda = 1$) lead to ρ' that satisfy very complicated nonlinear equations (involving, for $\lambda = 1$, 12 nonlinear terms) which, nevertheless, results in a theory fully equivalent to liner quantum mechanics. To distinguish between the linear theory and nonlinear theories that satisfy the "convexity principle on the diagonal" one has to invent a measurement that is not reducible to a measurement of particle's position.

It is a real pleasure to acknowledge the discussions I had on the subject with H.-D. Doebner, J. Hennig, W. Lücke, and P. Nattermann when I was a DAAD fellow in Arnold Sommerfeld Institute in Clausthal. I would like to especially thank G. A. Goldin who explained me the physical background of nonlinear gauge transformations and drawn my attention to the problem of convexity. This little piece of work is supported by the Polish-Flemish grant 007 and was completed during my stay in CLEA, Brussels.

---

[1] R. Feynman and A. Hibbs, *Quantum Mechanics and Path Integrals* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1965).

[2] B. Mielnik, Comm. Math. Phys. **15**, 1 (1969); *ibid.* **37**, 221 (1977).

[3] B. d'Espagnat, *Conceptual Foundations of Quantum Mechanics* (W. A. Benjamin, Reading, MA, 1976).

[4] S. Weigert, Phys. Rev. A **53**, 2078 (1996); *ibid.* **45**, 7688 (1992).

[5] The emerging field of quantum tomography sheds new light on possibilities of an experimental determination of an entire quantum state on a basis of positional measurements, cf. M. G. Raymer, Contemp. Phys. **38**, 343 (1997).

[6] H.-D. Doebner and G. A. Goldin, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 3764 (1996).

[7] H.-D. Doebner and G. A. Goldin, Phys. Lett. A, **162**, 397 (1992); J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **27**, 1771 (1994).

[8] G. A. Goldin, Nonlinear Math. Phys. **4**, 7 (1997).

[9] P. Nattermann, Rep. Math. Phys. **36**, 387 (1995).

[10] P. Nattermann and R. Zhdanov, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **29**, 2869 (1996).

[11] P. Nattermann and W. Scherer, in *Nonlinear, Deformed, and Irreversible Quantum Systems*, eds. H.-D. Doebner, V. K. Dobrev, and P. Nattermann (World Scientific, Singapore, 1995).

[12] P. Nattermann, in *Group21: Physical Applications and Mathematical Aspects of Geometry, Groups, and Algebras*, eds. H.-D. Doebner, W. Scherer, and P. Nattermann, vol. 1 (World Scientific, Singapore, 1997).

[13] W. Lücke, in *Nonlinear, Deformed, and Irreversible Quantum Systems*, eds. H.-D. Doebner, V. K. Dobrev, and P. Nattermann (World Scientific, Singapore, 1995).

[14] P. Nattermann, in *Symmetry in Science IX*, ed. B. Gruber (Plenum, New York, 1997).

[15] P. Nattermann, *Dynamics in Borel-Quantization: Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation vs. Master Equations*, Ph. D thesis, Technical University of Clausthal (Clausthal, 1997).

[16] The original transformations proposed by Doebner and Goldin deal with nonrelativistic spin-0 systems. A work on a generalization to the Dirac equation is in progress, H.-D. Doebner — private communication. In this note we do not want to additionally complicate the discussion by mingling it with the relativistic position operator

problem.

[17] I. Białynicki-Birula, M. Cieplak and J. Kamiński, *Theory of Quanta* (Oxford Univeristy Press, Oxford, 1992).

[18] I. Białynicki-Birula and J. Mycielski, Ann. Phys. (NY) **100**, 62 (1976).